Zorn's Lemma

An elementary proof under the Axiom of Choice

Arjun Jain

4th year Integrated MSc. Physics
Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee, Roorkee, India
E-mail address: arjunjain16@gmail.com

arXiv:1207.6698v1 [math.LO] 28 Jul 2012

Here, I present an elementary proof of Zorn's Lemma under the Axiom of Choice, simplifying and supplying necessary details in the original proof by Paul R. Halmos in *Naive Set Theory*[1].

To start with, I assume knowledge of basic Set Theory, i.e., axiom of extension, axiom of specification, axiom of pairing, axiom of unions, axiom of powers, ordered pairs, relations, functions, families, axiom of infinity, numbers, peano arithmetic, order, and the axiom of choice.

As the Axiom of Choice is central to the proof, here is the description, as given in Halmos's *Naive Set Theory*:

Axiom of Choice:
The Cartesian product of a non empty family of nonempty sets is non empty.

Suppose that $\mathscr{C}$ is a non empty collection of non empty sets. We can convert $\mathscr{C}$ into an indexed set, by using the collection $\mathscr{C}$ itself in the role of the index set and using the identity mapping on $\mathscr{C}$ in the role of the indexing. The axiom of choice, then says that the Cartesian product of the sets of $\mathscr{C}$ has at least one element. An element of such a Cartesian product is, by definition, a function whose domain is the index set ($\mathscr{C}$) and whose value at each index belongs to the set bearing that index. Therefore, an equivalent form of the Axiom of Choice is that there exists a function f with domain $\mathscr{C}$ such that if $A \in \mathscr{C}$, then $f(A) \in A$. This conclusion applies, in particular, in case $\mathscr{C}$ is the collection of all non empty subsets of a non empty set X. The assertion in that case, is that there exists a function f with domain $P(X) \setminus \{\varnothing\}$ such that if A is in that domain, then $f(A) \in A$. In intuitive language, the function f can be described as a simultaneous choice of an element from each of many sets; this is the reason for the name of the axiom.

1 A Preamble to Zorn's Lemma

The Statement of Zorn's Lemma is as follows:
If X is a partially ordered set such that every chain in X has an upper bound, then X contains a maximal element.

Although Zorn's name has been stuck to this Lemma, there were, similar maximal principles(esp.

[1]Paul R. Halmos. Naive Set theory. Van Nostrand Reinhold Company. 1960. Reprint by Martino Fine Books in 2011

by Hausdorff and Kuratowski), before Zorn published his results in 1933. But despite the fact, that there are many variants of Zorn's Lemma, they are all equivalent to each other and to the Axiom of Choice.
So, how did the term "Zorn's Lemma" come to be? Mycielski attributed to Semadeni[2], the following convincing explanation:
Namely, in Science, the consumer decides upon the name of the tools which he uses, and the consumer is not always the best informed person.
Nonetheless, there is no doubt that Zorn provided a great service in directing attention to the largely unrealized potential in maximal principles.

As an example, Zorn's Lemma can be used to prove that every non zero vector space has a basis. We consider the set of all linearly independent subsets of the given vector space V, partially ordered by inclusion. Let Y be a chain of linearly independent subsets of V. We note that the union of such a set can serve as an upper bound for it. To apply Zorn's lemma, we have to check whether the union is linearly independent. If $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ belong to the union, then each t_i belongs to some linearly independent set $L_i \in Y$. Because Y is a chain, one of these sets L_i contains all the others. If that is L_j, then the linear independence of L_j implies that no non trivial linear combination of $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ can be zero, which proves that the union of the sets in Y is linearly independent. Therefore, by Zorn's lemma, there is a maximal linearly independent set. Such a set is not just linearly independent, but also spans the whole space, since if it didnt we could just pick an element that did not belong to its linear span and we could add it to the linearly independent set, contradicting maximality.

2 Proof of Zorn's Lemma:

Proof.

First of all, the empty chain $\varnothing$, is a chain in X and by the hypothesis of Zorn's Lemma, must have an upper bound, say z, in X. As a result, $X \neq \varnothing$ and so, we can permit each element of X to be an upper bound of the empty chain $\varnothing$.

In all that follows, $X \neq \varnothing$.

Let $\bar{s}$ be the function form X to P(X), given by $\bar{s}$(x)=$\{y \in X : y \leq x\}$, and S=ran($\bar{s}$) be partially ordered by inclusion.
Then $\bar{s}$ is a one-to-one function, as, if not, $\exists x, y \in X$ with $x \neq y$, and $\bar{s}(x) = \bar{s}(y)$. But as $\bar{s}(x) = \bar{s}(y)$, we have $x \leq y$ and $y \leq x$. Therefore, x=y, which is a contradiction.
If $\exists x, y \in X$ with $x \leq y$, then $\bar{s}(x) \subset \bar{s}(y)$, as all elements less than x are less than or equal to y. On the other hand, if $\bar{s}(x) \subset \bar{s}(y)$, then $x \leq y$ because $x \in \bar{s}(x)$.
Thus, we have the following Lemma.

Lemma 1. *A necessary and sufficient condition for $\bar{s}(x) \subset \bar{s}(y)$ is $x \leq y$.*

This, immediately gives us the next Lemma.

Lemma 2. *If $\exists x \in X$ such that x is maximal in X, then $\bar{s}(x)$ is maximal in S and vice versa.*

Let $\mathscr{X}$ be the set of all chains in X, ordered by inclusion. Then, $\mathscr{X} \neq \varnothing$ as singletons and $\varnothing$ in P(X) are chains in X.

Suppose that $\mathscr{Y} \in \mathscr{X}$. By the hypothesis of Zorn's Lemma, $\mathscr{Y}$ has an upper bound in X, say z. Then, $\mathscr{Y} \subset \bar{s}(z)$.

[2]P.J. Campbell. The origin of "Zorn's lemma". Historia Math. , 5 (1978) pp. 7789

Let $\mathscr{C}$ be a chain in $\mathscr{X}$, and Y be $\cup\{C : C \in \mathscr{C}\}$.
If $\mathscr{C} = \varnothing$, then $Y = \varnothing$(the empty chain in X), which is in fact in $\mathscr{X}$.
Otherwise, $\exists$x,y$\in Y$, and $\exists C_x, C_y \in \mathscr{C}$ with $x \in C_x$ and $y \in C_y$. Moreover, $\mathscr{C}$ being a chain in $\mathscr{X}$, either $C_x \subset C_y$ or $C_y \subset C_x$.
If $C_x \subset C_y$, then x,y$\in C_y$ and therefore, x and y are comparable.
If $C_y \subset C_y$, then x,y$\in C_x$ and therefore, x and y are comparable.
The conclusion is that Y$\in \mathscr{X}$ for every chain $\mathscr{C}$ in $\mathscr{X}$.
Also, for all $C \in \mathscr{C}, C \subset Y$. Hence, Y is an upper bound for $\mathscr{C}$ in $\mathscr{X}$.
Therefore,

Lemma 3. *Every chain in $\mathscr{X}$ has an upper bound in $\mathscr{X}$, the union of the elements of the chain being one.*

We consider the case, when $\mathscr{X}$ has a maximal element, say N. As N is a chain in X, it has an upper bound in X, say n. Therefore, $N \cup \{n\}$ is a chain in X with $N \subset N \cup \{n\}$. But, as N is maximal in $\mathscr{X}$, $N \cup \{n\} = N$. So, $n \in N$ and is therefore the greatest element of N.
Hence,

Lemma 4. *A maximal chain in X has a unique upper bound in $\mathscr{X}$, which turns out to be its greatest element.*

Note that $\varnothing$ is not a maximal chain in X, as it is included in every singleton in P(X).

We continue to study the case, where N is a maximal element of $\mathscr{X}$.
We claim that $\bar{s}(n)$ is a maximal element of S, where n is the upper bound of N.
Let, if possible, $\bar{s}(n)$ not be a maximal element of S. Then, $\exists t \in X$, such that $\bar{s}(n) \subsetneq \bar{s}(t)$, i.e., $n < t$ by Lemma 1. As $N \subset \bar{s}(n)$, we have $N \subset \bar{s}(t)$ and therefore, t is an upper bound of N.
But, by Lemma 4, t=n, which leads to a contradiction.
Therefore, using Lemma 2, we have the following conclusion.

Lemma 5. *If N is a maximal chain in X with the upper bound n, then $\bar{s}(n)$ is a maximal element of S and n is a maximal element of X.*

To complete the proof of Zorn's Lemma, it is enough to show that $\mathscr{X}$ has a maximal element.

It will be more convenient and revealing to consider a general setup of a set $Z \subset P(X)$, satisfying:
1) $\varnothing \in Z$,
2) if $A \in Z$ and $B \subset A$, then $B \in Z$,
3) if $\mathscr{C}$ is a chain in Z, $\cup\{C : C \in \mathscr{C}\} \in Z$
and partially ordered by inclusion.

Note that $\mathscr{X}$ satisfies these properties, and thus our problem now reduces to proving that there exists a maximal element in Z.

For $A \in Z$, let $\hat{A} = \{x \in X : A \cup \{x\} \in Z\}$. Clearly, $A \subset \hat{A}$.

Note that $\hat{\varnothing} = \{x \in X : \{x\} \in Z\}$.
If $Z = \{\varnothing\}$, there exist no singletons in Z, and hence, $\hat{\varnothing} = \varnothing$. Also, if $\hat{\varnothing} = \varnothing$, then there exist no singletons in Z, and due to property 2) of Z, $Z = \{\varnothing\}$. Therefore, $\hat{\varnothing} = \varnothing$ if and only if $Z = \{\varnothing\}$.
On the other hand, if $Z \neq \{\varnothing\}$. Then $\exists C \in Z$ with $C \neq \varnothing$. As a result, $\exists z \in C$ and so $\{z\} \subset C$. From Property 2) of Z, $\{z\} \in Z$. So, $\hat{\varnothing} = \cup\{C : C \in Z\} \neq \varnothing$.

As explained in the description of the Axiom of Choice, there exists a function $f : P(X) \setminus \{\varnothing\} \to X$, such that $f(A) \in A$ for all $A \in dom(f)$.

Define a function $g : Z \to Z$ as follows:
a) If $\hat{A} \setminus A \neq \varnothing$, then g(A)=$A \cup \{f(\hat{A} \setminus A)\}$. Here, $g(A) \in Z$, as $f(\hat{A} \setminus A) \in \hat{A} \setminus A$.
b) If $\hat{A} \setminus A = \varnothing$, then g(A)=A.
Also, suppose that g(A)=A but $\hat{A} \setminus A \neq \varnothing$. Then $\{f(\hat{A} \setminus A)\} \in A$ but by definition, $\{f(\hat{A} \setminus A)\} \in \hat{A} \setminus A$, which leads to a contradiction.
Therefore, $\hat{A} \setminus A = \varnothing$, if and only if g(A)=A.

Clearly $A \subset g(A)$.

Also, note that $g(\varnothing) = f(\hat{\varnothing})$ if and only if $Z \neq \{\varnothing\}$, and $g(\varnothing) = \varnothing$ if and only if $Z = \{\varnothing\}$.

Suppose that $\exists A \in Z$, such that $\hat{A} \setminus A = \varnothing$ and A is not maximal in Z. Then, there exists a $C \in Z$, such that $A \subsetneq C$. Therefore, $\exists x \in C$, such that $x \notin A$. As $C \in Z$, by property 2) of Z, $A \cup \{x\} \in Z$ and so $x \in \hat{A}$. But, as $x \in \hat{A}$ and $x \notin A$, so $\hat{A} \setminus A \neq \varnothing$, which leads to a contradiction.
Also, if A is maximal in Z, there are no elements in X that can be adjoined to A to create a bigger set present in Z, and so $\hat{A} = A$.
Hence, we have the following Lemma.

Lemma 6. *A is maximal in Z, if and only if $\hat{A} \setminus A = \varnothing$, if and only if g(A)=A.*

Our problem now reduces to proving that there exists an A in Z such that g(A)=A.

Note that, although $\varnothing$ satisfies this requirement if $Z = \{\varnothing\}$, it does not suit our purpose of finding a maximal element in X, as, if $Z = \{\varnothing\}$, then $\mathscr{X} = \{\varnothing\}$, which means that $X = \varnothing$, which is not true due to the discussion in the beginning of the proof. Therefore, in further discussion, the search for a maximal element in Z will not include $\varnothing$.

Define a subset J of Z, to be a tower if:
1) $\varnothing \in J$,
2) if $A \in J$, then $g(A) \in J$, and
3) if $\mathscr{C}$ is a chain in J, $\cup\{C : C \in \mathscr{C}\} \in J$.
Such a J does exist, as Z itself satisfies these properties.

Note that $J = \{\varnothing\}$ if and only if $Z = \{\varnothing\}$. The reason is that, if $Z = \{\varnothing\}$, then the only subset of Z which satisfies the properties of a tower is $\{\varnothing\}$, and if $J = \{\varnothing\}$, then by property 2) of J, $g(\varnothing) \in J$ and so $g(\varnothing) = \varnothing$ which leads to $Z = \{\varnothing\}$, as explained before. Therefore, from the discussion above the definition of towers, $J = \{\varnothing\}$ is not allowed.

Also, the intersection of a non empty family $\{A_i\}$ of towers is a tower, as:
a) $\varnothing \in A$ for all i, therefore, $\varnothing \in \cap_i A_i$,
b) if $x \in \cap_i A_i$, then $x \in A_i$ for all i, and so by condition 2) in the definition of towers, g(x)$\in A_i$ for all i. Therefore, g(x)$\in \cap_i A_i$,
c) if $\mathscr{C}$ is a chain in $\cap_i A_i$, then it is a chain in A_i for all i and so $\cup\{C : C \in \mathscr{C}\} \in A_i$ for all i, and therefore $\cup\{C : C \in \mathscr{C}\} \in \cap_i A_i$.
Therefore,

Lemma 7. *Let J_o be the intersection of all towers, then J_o is the smallest tower.*

Let $B \in J_o$, be called comparable, if for all $A \in J_o$, either $A \subset B$ or $B \subset A$. Comparable sets do exist, as $\varnothing \in J_o$ and for all $A \in J_o$, $\varnothing \in A$.

Consider a particular comparable element $\mathfrak{C}$.
Suppose that $A \subsetneq \mathfrak{C}$. As $\mathfrak{C}$ is comparable and g(A)$\in J_o$ (as $A \in J_o$), therefore $g(A) \subset \mathfrak{C}$ or $\mathfrak{C} \subsetneq g(A)$. But $\mathfrak{C} \not\subseteq g(A)$ as, if $\mathfrak{C} \subsetneq g(A)$, then $A \subsetneq \mathfrak{C} \subsetneq g(A)$, but g(A) has at most one more element than A.

Therefore,
if $A \subsetneq \mathfrak{C}$, then $g(A) \subset \mathfrak{C}$.

For the particular comparable element $\mathfrak{C}$,
let U=$\{B \in J_o : B \subset \mathfrak{C}$ or $g(\mathfrak{C}) \subset B\}$, partially ordered by inclusion.

Then, $\varnothing \in U$ as $\varnothing \in J_o$ and $\varnothing \subset \mathfrak{C}$.

Also, if $A \in U$, then $g(A) \in U$ due to the following:
As $A \in J_o$, $g(A) \in J_o$.
Case 1: If $A \subsetneq \mathfrak{C}$, then $g(A) \subset \mathfrak{C}$, as proved above. Therefore, $g(A) \in U$.
Case 2: If $A = \mathfrak{C}$, then $g(A) = g(\mathfrak{C})$ and so $g(\mathfrak{C}) \subset g(A)$. Therefore, $g(A) \in U$.
Case 3: If $g(\mathfrak{C}) \subset A$, then as $A \subset g(A)$, $g(\mathfrak{C}) \subset g(A)$. Therefore, $g(A) \in U$.

Consider a chain $\mathscr{C}$ in U.
For any $E \in \mathscr{C}$, $E \in U$ and so E can be of two types:
Type 1: $E \subset \mathfrak{C}$.
Type 2: $g(\mathfrak{C}) \subset E$.
We note that the only element of $\mathscr{C}$ of both Type 1 and Type 2, if any, is $\mathfrak{C}$, and that too, if and only if $\mathfrak{C}$ is maximal in Z, as $g(\mathfrak{C}) \subset E \subset \mathfrak{C}$ implies that $E = \mathfrak{C} = g(\mathfrak{C})$.
Let Y=$\cup\{C : C \in \mathscr{C}\}$. There are two possibilities for Y:
Possibility 1: All elements of $\mathscr{C}$ are of Type 1. Then, all elements of Y are in $\mathfrak{C}$ and so $Y \subset \mathfrak{C}$.
Possibility 2: Atleast one of the Cs in $\mathscr{C}$, say E, is of Type 2. Then, $g(\mathfrak{C}) \subset E$. As $E \subset Y$, therefore $g(\mathfrak{C}) \subset Y$.
As a result, $Y \in U$.

From the previous three paragraphs, U is a tower included in J_o.
But due to Lemma 7, U=J_o. Therefore, for all $A \in J_o$, $A \in U$ and so $A \subset \mathfrak{C}$ or $g(\mathfrak{C}) \subset A$.
As $A \subset \mathfrak{C}$ implies that $A \subset g(\mathfrak{C})$, therefore for all $A \in J_o$, $A \subset g(\mathfrak{C})$ or $g(\mathfrak{C}) \subset A$.
As a result,

Lemma 8. *If $\mathfrak{C}$ is comparable, then $g(\mathfrak{C})$ is also comparable.*

Now let C_o be the set of all comparable sets. Clearly, C_o is a chain in J_o, as comparable sets are comparable with each other.

1. $\varnothing \in C_o$.
2. From Lemma 8, if $C \in C_o$, then $g(C) \in C_o$.
3. Consider a chain $\mathscr{C}$ in C_o.
If $E \in \mathscr{C}$, then for a particular $A \in J_o$, E can be of two types:
Type 1: $A \subset E$.
Type 2: $E \subset A$.
Note that the only element of $\mathscr{C}$ of both Type 1 and Type 2, if any, is A itself.
Let Y=$\cup\{C : C \in \mathscr{C}\}$. There are two possibilities for Y:
Possibility 1: All elements of $\mathscr{C}$ are of Type 2. Then, all elements of Y are in A, i.e., $Y \subset A$.
Possibility 2: Atleast one of the Cs in $\mathscr{C}$, say E, is of Type 1. Then, $A \subset E$. As, $E \subset Y$, therefore $A \subset Y$.
Therefore, Y is comparable with A. As A was an arbitrary element of J_o, Y is a comparable set, and hence, $Y \in C_o$.

From 1), 2) and 3) in the previous paragraph, we infer that C_o is a tower. But by Lemma 7, $C_o = J_o$. Hence, the important result:

Lemma 9. *J_o is a chain in J_o.*

Now, let A=$\cup\{C : C \in J_o\}$.
Due to Lemma 9 and property 3) of towers, $A \in J_o$.
By property 2) of towers, as $A \in J_o$, therefore $g(A) \in J_o$.
Also, as A is the union of all sets in J_o, $g(A) \subset A$.
But as $A \subset g(A)$ always, therefore **A=g(A)**.

Thus, we have obtained the desired result.